

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,686,973 ("Su"). No claims have been amended hereby. The Listing of Claims is solely for the convenience of the Examiner. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in light of the below remarks.

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art ("AAPA") in view of Su. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 is the only independent claim. Among the limitations of independent claim 1 that are neither taught nor suggested in the art of record is "correcting a distortion of the image that has been captured by said imaging means."

The AAPA was relied upon for certain basic structures of a material presentation device. The Office Action conceded that the AAPA did not teach the salient features of the independent claim discussed above. The Action relied on Su to provide these features. Applicant respectfully disagrees that Su cures the deficiencies of the AAPA.

Su relates to correcting the distortion in a projected image that is caused by a shifted or misaligned projecting device. Thus, Su addresses an entirely different problem and, as described below, in a different manner. If a deviation from the standard alignment of the projecting device is detected, Su intentionally distorts the input image signal to correct for the misalignment. The first step in the correction process is to detect the disposition distance and the horizontal vertical inclination angle. *See* Fig. 2, step 30; col. 3, ll. 43-45. If so, then a deviation from the standard position is obtained. *See* Fig. 2, step 34;

col. 3, ll. 58-60. Accordingly, “a trapezium distortion **is caused** to cause the quality of the projected image.” *See* col. 3, l. 66 – col. 4, l. 1 (emphasis added).

In Su, therefore, an undistorted input image is forced to be distorted to compensate for the non-standard position and angle of the projecting device. In that way, the distorted image appears to be correctly projected onto a screen. Contrary to the present invention, there is no teaching in Su that corrects a distorted image. For this reason, Su fails to teach or suggest the image correction feature of the present claim, and no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established.

In direct contrast to the teachings of Su, claim 1 of the present invention recites “correcting a distortion of the image that has been captured by said imaging means.” That is, a feature of the independent claim relates to picking up a distorted image and subsequently correcting this distorted image so that it can be displayed free of distortions. This is completely opposite of the disclosure in Su, which teaches taking a perfectly good image and intentionally inducing distortion therein.

The Office Action cites to col. 3, line 1 to col. 5, line 8 of Su in response to the limitation of “correcting a distortion of the image that has been captured by said imaging means.” But these portions of Su do not show that a distorted image has been captured and subsequently corrected, as recited in claim 1.

For these reasons, even when the AAPA and Su references are combined, they do not teach or suggest the salient features of the independent claim discussed above. Thus, claim 1 is patentable over the cited references.

Claims 2-20 dependent directly from and contain all the limitations of independent claim 1. These dependent claims recite additional limitations, which, in combination with the limitations of claim 1 are neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited references and are directed towards patentable subject matter. Thus, claims 2-20 should also be allowed.

Applicant has responded to all of the rejections recited in the Office Action. Reconsideration and Notice of Allowance for all of the pending claims is therefore respectfully requested.

Dated: September 6, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By /Michael J. Scheer/
Michael J. Scheer

Registration No.: 34,425
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 277-6500
Attorney for Applicant